Application No.: 10/774,577

Amdt. dated October 27, 2006

Reply to Office Action dated July 27, 2006

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for considering the pending application. The

Office Action dated July 27, 2006 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1, 8, 10, and 12 are hereby amended. No new matter has been added.

Accordingly, claims 1-16 are currently pending. Reconsideration of the pending claims is

respectfully requested.

Initially, Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating the elected species is allowable.

Applicants also thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended over the telephone conference held

on September 8, 2006. During the telephone conversation the Examiner clarified the progression

the Examiner is undertaking to consider all the various species the Examiner has identified in the

pending claims. According to the interview, the Examiner will consider each species in turn and

automatically move from one to the next once the Examiner determines that the species under

consideration is allowable. Additionally, in progressing through the examination, the Examiner

also indicated that the first time a new species is rejected, the Office Action will be a non-final

action.

The Office Action rejects claims 8, 9, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as

being indefinite for containing the language "and the like". Claims 8 and 12 have been amended

accordingly. Additionally, claims 1, and 10 have also been amended for the same reason. As

such, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

The Office Action also rejects claims 8, 9, and 12, under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,780,529 to Kimura ("Kimura"). To anticipate a claim, the prior

art reference must teach each and every element of the claim. Kimura fails to teach all the

elements of claims 8, 9, and 12 and thus cannot anticipate these claims.

8

DC:50431431.1

Docket No.: 8650.027 US

Application No,: 10/774,577

Amdt. dated October 27, 2006

Reply to Office Action dated July 27, 2006

Amended claims 8 and 12 recite, inter alia, "R₅ and R₆ are non-purine containing

substituents." Kimura fails to teach at least this limitation. In fact, Kimura teaches the exact

opposite, i.e. "at least one of the one or more organic layers comprises a compound having a purine

skeleton." See Kimura, col. 2, ll. 46-49. The compound cited on page 4 of the Office Action

includes purine substituents at the corresponding R_5 and R_6 of the claims in the instant application.

Accordingly, Kimura does not and cannot anticipate the present invention. Claim 9 depends on

claim 8 and thus is allowable over Kimura for at least the same reasons as claim 8. As such

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

The application is in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully

solicited. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for

allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to

discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All

correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a

petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37

C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the

filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any

overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: October 27, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

Rebecca G. Rucich

Registration No.: 41,786

McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorneys for Applicant

9

DC:50431431.1

Docket No.: 8650.027 US